THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 July 2002

AM 10:00 **CONVENE**, Suite 312, 441 F Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes: 20 June 2002

B. Dates of next meetings: 19 September 2002
17 October 2002

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Capital Planning Commission

CFA 18/JUL/02- 1, Designing for Security in the Nation's Capital - Urban Design and Security Plan. Information presentation by the Chairman of NCPC.

B. National Park Service / American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 18/JUL/02- 2, World War II Memorial. 17th Street at the Rainbow Pool. Bas-relief panels and announcement stone. Designs. (Previous: CFA 21/MAR/02 -1).

C. National Park Service

1. CFA 18/JUL/02- 3, Tomas Garrigue Masaryk Memorial. Reservation 57, Massachusetts Avenue and 22nd Street, NW. Final. (Previous: CFA 20/JUN/02- 2).

2. CFA 18/JUL/02- 4, Jefferson Memorial. Ohio Drive. Perimeter security barriers. Revised concept. (Previous: CFA 16/MAY/02 - 2).

3. CFA 18/JUL/02- 5, Federal Reserve Board, William M. Martin Building, C Street and Virginia Avenue, NW. Temporary sculpture exhibition. (Previous: CFA 21/FEB/02-2).

D. General Services Administration

CFA 18/JUL/02- 6, D.C. Court of Appeals (Old City Hall) and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. Judiciary Square, Southwest corner at Indiana Avenue and 5th Street, NW. New shared underground parking facility. Concept-Phase I.

E. National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund

CFA 18/JUL/02- 7, National Law Enforcement Museum. Judiciary Square (Federal Reservation #7), E Street between Court Buildings E and C, and north of Old City Hall. Concept--design guidelines.

F. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

CFA 18/JUL/02- 8, John F. Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts. New exterior lighting scheme. Design. (Previous: CFA 16/MAY/02 - 4).

G. Department of the Treasury/U.S. Mint

1. CFA 18/JUL/02- 9, George W. Bush Bronze Presidential Medal. Design.

2. CFA 18/JUL/02- 10, General Henry H. Shelton Congressional Gold Medal. Design.

H. Smithsonian Institution/National Zoological Park

1. CFA 18/JUL/02- 11, National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue, NW, New entrance gates and lion sculptures. Concept.

2. CFA 18/JUL/02- 12, Farm Exhibit. Olmsted Walk near the Beach Drive entrance. Final. (Previous: CFA 19/JUL/01- 7).

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS continued, 18 July 2002

I. Department of the Navy

CFA 18/JUL/02- 13, Defense Intelligence Analysis Center. Bolling Air Force Base, Luke Avenue and Chappie James Boulevard, SE. New building/addition. Final. (Previous: CFA 18/OCT/01- 2).

J. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 02- 256, Georgetown University. 3700 O Street, NW. Ryan Administration Building. MBNA Performing Arts Center addition. Revised concept. (Previous: O.G. 02-79, last seen CFA 21 March 2002).

b. O.G. 02- 215, Dumbarton Oaks. 1703 32nd Street, NW. New library and service buildings and landscape alterations. Revised concept. (Previous: O.G. 02-135, last seen CFA 21 March 2002).

c. Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 02-102, Arena Stage. 1101 Sixth Street, SW. Additions, alterations and reconfiguration. Concept.

b. Appendix II.

III. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery of Art, Objects proposed for acquisition.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-189 HPA. 01-393	3325 Prospect Street, NW Georgetown University Georgetown Public Policy Institute Wormley School	Roof addition, site work and alterations - revised design - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Case has been inactive for a period of time pending revisions to the design following discussion with neighbors. File new concept submission for proposed design for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-52 HPA. 02-89	2816 O Street, NW Subohd Arora Residence	Addition of third floor and side bay window - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed third floor addition as shown in Option 1of supplemental drawings received and dated 28 June 2002, which indicate replication of the existing pediment on front facade, with a height of gable ridge of 31'-10" above front yard grade. Recommend further study to lower the eave and ridge lines of the roof as much as possible in comparison with the neighbor's ridge line. No objection to concept for an iron fence and gates in front yard, PROVIDED brick piers are deleted. File new submission of working drawings, including details and landscape plan, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-134 HPA. 02-219	3123-3125 M Street, NW Vivian Arpad / Norman Seidenberg Revocable Trust Commercial	Alterations to storefront and new awning - revised design - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Case was superseded by new concept submission under case O.G. 02-247.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-164 HPA. 02-276	3320 M Street, NW 3320 M Street LLC. Design Center West Hollis & Knight	Awning and signs - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for two proposed awnings over entrance bays and storefront window, with a sign composed of lettering reading "Hollis & Knight" limited to the valance of awning above entry door as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 27 June 2002. No objection to retention of existing sign applied to glass of storefront window. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-174 HPA. 02-310	2733 P Street, NW Soraya Chemaly / Thomas Jones Residence	Alteration and repair to rear windows and stairs - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed repair of front basement window after removal of air conditioner unit, and for alterations to rear, including repair of window sill, a new rear door with transom window, a third story door, and new wood stoop as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 22 May 2002 with details received and dated 3 July 2002. No roof deck over rear wing is proposed at this time.

O.G. 02-199 HPA. 02-347	3251 Prospect Street. NW Georgetown Prospect Place Assoc. Bangkok Bistro	Unenclosed sidewalk café - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed extension to existing unenclosed sidewalk café on public space as shown in supplemental information received and dated 8 July 2002, which indicate tables and chairs to match existing and no more than five umbrellas PROVIDED their fabric coverings do not include any sign or lettering. Location of tables and post and chain dividers on the western edge of café will accommodate pedestrian circulation next to existing tree grate. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-191 HPA. 02-333	3100 South Street, NW Millennium Partners Georgetown Incinerator	Revision to permit for skylight glass, paving of sidewalks and other alterations, sign program - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign scheme for Loews Theatres, including 24-inch high internally-illuminated individually-pin-mounted letters on marquee of glass wall at entrance on K Street, and for vertical signs on Wisconsin Avenue and 31st Street composed of 12-inch high back-lit individually-pin-mounted aluminum channel letters reading "Lowes" ONLY. Proposed directional red oval signs were NOT approved and have been deleted from submission. The Commission recommends a waiver of the size restrictions for the proposed marquee sign due to the nature of the project and the location of sign below Whitehurst Freeway. No objection to revisions to permit, including deletion of louver on glass wall skylight at entry, new circular skylight to close opening atop smokestack, for modifications to approved design for entry canopies at hotel and residential building, and brick paving of sidewalks to match brick selection used on M Street and Wisconsin Avenue streetscape projects. Request mock-up sample of installation of snap-on metal reveals on window wall system for review prior to installation of a modified design of approved aluminum "I-beam" elements.

O.G. 02-214 HPA. 00-357	3336 M Street, NW East Banc, Inc. The Valentino Project Design Center West	Alterations to storefront - revised design - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed revisions to permit for new storefront, part of the Design Center West, as shown in Scheme 2 of supplemental drawings received and dated 27 June 2002 which indicate retention of existing wood cornice above masonry opening and a continuous roof over two new bay windows. Detailing of cornice on bays will match existing detailing. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-216 * HPA. 02-392	1523 31st Street, NW David and Bernice Blair Residence	Rear addition - revised design - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated July 2002 which indicate treatment of wall with wood trim and stucco to match existing condition on pediment at front of historic house. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-220 HPA. 02-395	3300 Q Street, NW Mr. and Mrs. Khan Mary Seco Residence	Alterations to parking pad, patio and fence - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to side yard, including improvements to parking pad for one vehicle, iron swing gates, brick garden walls, patio with new shed, and reconstruction of planters on public space as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 21 June and 24 June 2002; and for alterations to building including iron railing on second floor balcony and new railing on second floor door opening onto Q Street, as shown in supplemental drawings received 16 July 2002 which indicate railing installed within masonry opening for door rather than in front of brick wall. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-227 HPA. 02-402	3417 Dent Place, NW Drew Callahan Residence	Two story rear addition - revised design - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** concept design for proposed two-story rear addition which, as proposed, introduces a new structure in the middle of the rear yard connected to the main house by a one-story corridor. There is no objection to general concept of a rear addition PROVIDED it is in scale and compatible in size and design with the historic building, which is part of a row of three buildings. File new submission of revised design with concept application for review by the Commission when ready.

* see ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-228 HPA. 02-403	1415 27th Street, NW David Keller Residence	Alterations to garage door for new windows, and rear addition - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed alteration to garage door for windows and entry door to match detailing of new wood trim, or for proposed one-story rear addition with roof deck and alterations to rear second floor window for French doors. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-230 HPA. 02-405	1318 30th Street, NW Alexandra Scott Residence	Alterations and relocation of meters - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to rear wing of house, including dropping sill of window for new door, and enclosure of space beneath lean-to sheds, all within enclosed courtyard behind a wood board fence, which limits visibility from public thoroughfare. Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for relocation of electric and gas meters to the exterior walls. Electric and gas meters should remain in existing location within courtyard where they will not be visible from public thoroughfare. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval. Commission regrets that work on exterior started prior to review.

O.G. 02-231 HPA. 02-406	3401 M Street, NW John Souliotis Running Company	Signs - existing - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for existing sign composed of 12 to 14-inch high individually-pin-mounted letters reading "Running Company" on sign panel facing on M Street. Existing sign panel above entry door was NOT approved at this location and should be relocated to 34th Street side. Address numbers can be applied to transom over door. Existing sign on 34th Street side of corner entry was NOT approved and must be removed prior to 30 October 2002.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-232 HPA. 02-417	1242 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Jefferson / Uniwest Max Studio.com	Signs and logo - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed non-illuminated sign composed of 8 3/4 -inch high pin-mounted brushed aluminum channel letters reading "Max Studio.com" with a 1'-7 1/4" high logo, and for one sign composed of 3 ½-inch high vinyl letters applied to storefront. Detail drawings conform to approved permit. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-161).

O.G. 02-236 HPA. 02-427	3100 R Street, NW Helen Henderson Residence	Iron fence and gate on public space - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 33-feet extension of existing 2'-6" high iron fence. Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed installation of new 3'-6" high fence and gates in area in front of steps to front door.

O.G. 02-237 HPA. 02-432	3017 P Street, NW John and Susan Mullens Residence	Alterations to windows on rear wing - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 2 July 2002 indicate that proposed alterations to windows on first floor of rear wing will not be visible from public thoroughfare. Replacement front door will match details of existing wood front door. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 02-238 HPA. 02-433	3115 P Street, NW Georgetown Presbyterian Church	Alterations to sidewalk - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for excavation of electrical trench and reconstruction of sidewalk with salvaged brick pavers. Temporary removal of pavers is in coordination with underground work for electrical upgrade. Surface conditions will be restored to original appearance after underground work is completed and no patch-work will be visible.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-239 HPA. 02-434	1416 35th Street, NW David Woolley Residence	New fence on rear yard fence - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 2 July 2002 indicate that proposed new fence on rear yard will not be visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 02-240 HPA. 02-435	3251 Prospect Street, NW Café Milano	Temporary enclosure in front and addition to rear - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed temporary enclosure of sidewalk café in front of Café Milano, and for rear addition within courtyard to extend existing enclosure as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 26 June 2002. Recommend development of front enclosure as shown either in Scheme 1, with a continuous shed awning roof, or in Scheme 2, with 2 tent like roofs connected by skylight. Scheme 3 was not approved. File new submission of working drawings, including details, material samples and information for proposed sign scheme, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-241 HPA. 02-436	2804 O Street, NW Nelse Greenway Residence	Trellis over side patio door - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed installation of wood trellis above side patio door. Recommend trellis be painted white or stained. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-242 HPA. 02-437	3259 M Street, NW Coach Commercial	Alterations to storefront, awnings and signs - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for alterations to storefront which, as proposed, are out-of-character with the historic building. Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed oversized pin-mounted sign reading "Coach" above third floor windows. Recommend further study of alterations to the storefront that would retain existing masonry opening and introduce elements of a more traditional design consistent with the historic building. No objection to concept of awnings on upper floor windows. File new submission of revised design, with concept application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-243 HPA. 02-439	1239 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Zlotnick Kraft/DC LLC Commercial	Alterations to storefront - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** concept design for alterations which, as proposed, would remove remaining historic fabric on storefront. Recommend further study of alterations to the storefront retaining original cornice, door frames and transoms, and maintaining original masonry opening. File new submission of revised design with concept application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-244 HPA. 02-440	1413 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Lisa Thompson Commercial	Lattice fence on rear 2nd floor and alterations - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to rear second floor level, including lattice fence and new window openings. Working drawings conform to approved concept design. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-213).

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-246 HPA. 02-441	3700 O Street, NW Georgetown University Southwest Quadrangle Retaining wall for garage structure	New residential/ dining and maintenance facility - revision to permit - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for revisions to permit for approved design for new residential / dining / and maintenance facility at the Southwest Quadrangle at Georgetown University, including modifications to landscape plan, relocation of sidewalk along entrance driveway, replacement of driveway pavers with asphalt, deletion of stairs on East side, and replacement of curved stone walls for evergreen hedges around the residence hall. Recommend finishing of concrete low walls around mechanical areaways located around residence hall rather than leaving form work in raw finish as proposed. Stone facing of main retaining wall with entrances to the garage and maintenance facilities must be installed before current permit expires, as previously approved. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 00-215).

O.G. 02-247 HPA. 02-442	3123-3125 M Street, NW Vivian Arpad / Norman Seidenberg Revocable Trust Commercial	Alterations to storefront and new awning - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed alterations to storefronts, including repair of existing historic fabric and new shop windows, removal of wall sign and light fixture, and new awning. File new submission of working drawings, including details, information on a replacement projecting sign and a fabric sample for the awning, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-248 HPA. 02-443	2813 Q Street, NW Paul Opalack Residence	Roof deck and rear spiral stair - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed roof deck and rear spiral stair connecting to second floor balcony. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-183). Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-249 HPA. 02-444	3301 N Street, NW Davies Williams Residence	Replacement of front steps - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement front steps. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-250 HPA. 02-445	1238 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Zara U.S.A.	Signs - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed installation of five non-illuminated signs composed of 10-inch high individually-pin-mounted brushed stainless steel letters and four silk-screened signs on Wisconsin Avenue shop windows composed of 5-inch high letters, all reading "Zara". The Commission recommends waiver on number of signs on this building which is composed of a number of separate storefronts along Wisconsin Avenue and has a long facade on Prospect Street.

O.G. 02-251 HPA. 02-446	1316 30th Street, NW Mr. and Mrs. John Merriam Residence	1-story rear addition - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed one story rear addition of wrap-around enclosed porch as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 26 June and 15 July 2002 which indicate transom windows deleted. Working drawings indicate revisions in-keeping with approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-210).

O.G. 02-252 HPA. N/A	3318 Volta Place, NW 3318 Volta L.L.C.	Alterations to rear and roof deck over one-story wing - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed alterations to rear, including new French doors on first and second floors and a roof deck over one-story rear wing. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-253 HPA. 02-447	3124 Q Street, NW Herb and Patrice Miller Bowie-Sevier-Miller House Residence	New stairs and garden wall in front yard on public space - revisions to permit - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed revisions to approved design for front terrace at the historic Bowie Sevier House, including circular stairs on public space, stepping retaining wall along sidewalk, and front stairs to townhouse. Recommend retention of 2-foot high stone wall along temporary parking/drop-off area of driveway as previously approved and as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 10 July 2002. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-41).

O.G. 02-254 HPA. 02-448	3016 O Street, NW Nick Nichols Residence	Parking pad off alley and pergola - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations for parking pad off alley, including in-swing wood gates, painted wood board fence above existing concrete wall (combined total height to be no taller than 7'-0" high), and wood trellis over parking area. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-255 HPA. 02-449	2804 Q Street, NW Dale Lenzner Residence	Alterations to windows at rear - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 2 July 2002 indicate that proposed alterations to windows on rear facade will not be visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-257 HPA. 02-451	1620 29th Street, NW Andreas Kristinus Residence	Addition of garage off alley at rear - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to general concept of proposed rear addition for garage off alley, including roof terrace, gate and replacement fences. Recommend careful study of details for garage wall facing alley, landscaping of terrace, and fence/wall along property line. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-258 HPA. 02-452	3016 Cambridge Place, NW Basil Kavalsky Residence	Three story rear addition and alteration for front stoop - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed three story rear addition and for new front door and replacement steel stoop with cast iron newel post in original stoop location, PROVIDED thicker balusters and handrail on front stairs are used as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 12 July 2002. Working drawings, conform to approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-226)

O.G. 02-259 HPA. 02-454	1415 27th Street, NW David Keller Residence	Alterations to garage door for new windows, - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to first floor of front facade, including removal of garage door, new 7/8 - inch muntin true-divided-light single pane window in new window opening and relocation of entry door with matching trim. Recommend use of standard profiles for proposed trim. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-228).

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-260 HPA. 02-455	1407 33rd Street, NW Riddleberger and Strohl Residence	Replacement windows and entry door - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** concept design for complete overhaul of existing historic windows which should be repaired. No objection to concept design for a 4 or 5 panel replacement front door. No objection to removal or replacement of security grilles on basement windows. Note is made that proposed alterations and pergola addition at rear yard, which would not be visible from public thoroughfare based on a site visit on 2 July 2002, were removed from submission by applicant pending further revisions to the design after discussions with neighbors.

O.G. 02-261 HPA. 02-460	1231 29th Street, NW Lisa Chavarria Residence	Replacement roof and repair of windows - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Proposed roof replacement is not visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board. Proposed work on windows is repair, retaining original materials and character. Work on shutters is repair work to match original. Roof replacement over bay window should match original.

O.G. 02-265 HPA. 02-477	1211 Wisconsin Avenue, NW GFZ Realty Bebe	Sign on side wall - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed light fixture and vertical sign composed of 12-inch high individually-pin-mounted letters reading "Bebe" which are inappropriate in this location on side wall facing onto parking lot for Riggs Bank.

ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-216 HPA. 02-392	1523 31st Street, NW David and Bernice Blair Residence	Rear addition - revised design - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 26 July 2002 which indicate treatment of wall with wood trim and stucco to match existing condition on pediment at front of historic house. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-094 HPA. 02-431	3439 Mt. Pleasant Street, NW T. Moore Residence	Two-story rear addition - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Property is outside the jurisdiction of the Shipstead-Luce Act and therefore does not come under the Commission's review. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

S.L. 02-095 HPA. 02-438	2635 Garfield Street, NW Weymouth Residence	Rear Addition - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition with a single double-hung window and door on the first floor rear elevation as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 9 July 2002. Note is made that permit application is pending submission of plat for review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further reviews in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

S.L. 02-096 HPA. 02-457	3520 Connecticut Avenue, NW Subway Sandwich Shop	Sign - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **against** issuance of permit for internally illuminated blade sign as shown in drawings received and dated 8 July 2002. Application lacks sufficient information to make a recommendation. File new submission of working drawings, including details, and photographs of existing eonditions, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-097	601 Pennsylvania Avenue Saul Subsidiary II Limited Partnership	Dish antenna - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **against** concept design for the installation of a dish antenna on penthouse roof as per drawings received and dated 8 July 2002. This location is too visible from the Capitol Building and the Mall environs. Suggest locating the antenna on the lower roof to the north of the penthouse enclosure so that it is screened from principle views from the monumental core of the city. File new submission of working drawings, including details, and photographs of existing conditions, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

S.L. 02-098 HPA. 02-461	2600 Tilden Street, NW Peoples Republic of China	Addition to and renovation of accessory building - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for the rear addition and the renovation and repair of the accessory building as shown in drawings received and dated 8 July 2002. See previous Recommendations (S.L.02-051 & S.L.02-052). Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further reviews in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

S.L. 02-099	445 12th Street, SW Federal Communication Commission	Security booth and bollards - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the concept design for proposed security booth and bollards as shown in drawings received and dated 8 July 2002. Recommend a slight increase in the size of the security booth for the comfort of the security personnel occupying the booth.

S.L. 02-100 HPA. 02-494	601 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Lawrence Rubin Company Cosí Downtown	Awnings - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed awnings with lights as shown in drawings received and dated 8 July 2002.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-101	2131 Yorktown Road, NW D. Grant Residence	Sunroom addition and replacement windows and doors And landscaping - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Case was superseded by permit submission under case S.L. 02-106

S.L. 02-103	4630 Broad Branch Road, NW Bo Green Residence	Replacement garage - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for a proposed replacement two-story garage as shown in drawings received and dated 10 July 2002. Note is made that permit application is pending submission of plat for review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further reviews in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

S.L. 02-104 HPA. 02-506	1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Host Marriott	Masonry restoration - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for a proposed masonry restoration and temporary scaffolding as shown in drawings received and dated 11 July 2002.

S.L. 02-105 HPA. 02-510	215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE Firehook Bakery	Sidewalk café - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for a proposed sidewalk café with six (6) tables and no umbrellas as shown in drawings received and dated 15 July 2002.

S.L. 02-106	2131 Yorktown Road, NW D. Grant Residence	Sunroom addition, replacement windows and doors, and landscaping - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed sunroom addition, replacement windows and doors, and landscaping as shown in drawings received and dated 16 July 2002.

U.S. COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
401 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS PRE-MEETING TOURS

18 July 2002

17 July, 8:30 p.m. Convene at the National Building Museum for trip to inspect a revised mock-up of new lighting for the Kennedy Center.

18 July, 8:00 a.m. Convene at the National Building Museum to inspect the following sites:

1. Judiciary Square, for sites of the National Law Enforcement Officers Museum and the D.C. Courts underground parking garage.
2. Arena Stage, to view existing conditions in preparation for review of proposed additions.
3. Lincoln Memorial, to inspect mock-ups of proposed security barriers and bollards.

Members present:
Harry G. Robinson, Chairman
Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel, Vice-Chairman
Carolyn Brody
Donald A. Capoccia
Pamela Nelson
Eden Rafshoon

Staff present:
Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Frederick J. Lindstrom, Assistant Secretary
Ms. Sue Kohler
Ms. Susan Raposa

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 July 2002

The meeting was convened at 10:20 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices in the National Building Museum, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, after a tour of project sites.

Members present: Hon. Harry G. Robinson III, Chairman
Hon. Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel, Vice-Chairman
Hon. Carolyn Brody
Hon. Donald A. Capoccia
Hon. Pamela Nelson
Hon. Eden Rafshoon

Staff present: Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Frederick J. Lindstrom, Assistant Secretary
Ms. Sue Kohler
Mr. José Martínez-Canino
Ms. Susan Raposa

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

Before the usual administrative items were addressed, the Secretary noted that it was the usual practice and tradition of the Commission, in the event of a Chairman's death or absence, to elect a new Chairman. He said it would be appropriate at this time if the Vice-Chairman wished to consider taking action in that regard.

The Vice-Chairman declared the floor open for nominations. Ms. Diamonstein moved that Mr. Robinson, who had served as Vice-Chairman for seven years and as Chairman from time to time, be nominated Chairman. There were no further nominations, and the Vice-Chairman asked for a vote; he was elected Chairman unanimously.

Mr. Robinson then asked for nominations for the position of Vice-Chairman. Mrs. Nelson nominated Ms. Diamonstein, and Mr. Capoccia seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations, and Ms. Diamonstein was elected Vice-Chairman unanimously.

The Commission congratulated the two new officers and then turned to the administrative items listed on the agenda.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the minutes of the 20 June meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as:
19 September
17 October

The Chairman noted that an August meeting was a possibility, and he would give the members two weeks' notice if it were required.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Capital Planning Commission

CFA 18/JUL/02-1, Designing for Security in the Nation's Capital–Urban Design and Security Plan. Information presentation by the Chairman of NCPC. The Secretary introduced John Cogbill, Chairman of NCPC, and noted that the Commission's Assistant Secretary, Frederick Lindstrom, had served as a member of their task force.

Mr. Cogbill noted that their task had been to take a comprehensive look at security in the monumental core and determine how security guidelines could be implemented and still retain the stateliness and beauty of the capital, rather than detract from it as the Jersey barriers and other haphazard installations had done. He then asked one of his staff members, George Toop, to present the plan, to be followed by Elizabeth Miller, who would discuss its implementation.

Mr. Toop recalled the interim report, issued in November 2002, which had to do with the White House and Pennsylvania Avenue, and said it had been followed with a plan for the entire monumental core. Its premise was that security did not need to look like security, that it needed to be integrated into the fabric of the city and actually upgrade the urban landscape. He noted that they had been dealing primarily with physical perimeter security, which occurred for the most part on the sidewalk or at the curb, where it would offer the maximum stand-off distance, and it had been designed for the threat of a bomb-laden vehicle. Pointing out that it could not be a "one-size-fits-all" design, he mentioned areas such as the Federal Triangle and President's Park which had their own character and so could not be treated in the same way; therefore, they would be looked at by different designers.

Mr. Toop then went through these special areas, pointing out the approach to security installations in each. Beginning with Pennsylvania Avenue at the White House, he recalled that they had invited four firms to prepare concept designs, based on the assumption that the avenue in this area would be closed, at least in the immediate future, to normal vehicular traffic. The winning team was Michael Van Valkenburgh & Associates, and Mr. Toop noted that they would be retained to develop their plan further. He pointed out on a plan the proposed pedestrian precinct, which was the former street area, between the White House and Lafayette Square; on the north side, framed by rows of trees, there would be a vehicular street to be used by a public transit carrier called the Circulator, and also by law enforcement vehicles. For motorcades and VIP travel, the surface of the pedestrian precinct could be used; it would have a crushed granite surface, as would the Circulator road. Any vehicle wishing to enter the roadway would be checked at a guardhouse that would be set in a bosque of trees to preserve the park-like, pedestrian atmosphere.

Mr. Toop noted that although each of the special districts had its own character, there were also commonalities, such as the L'Enfant street plan with its monumental diagonal avenues, other diagonal avenues, and the basic city grid system. On Pennsylvania Avenue between the White House and the Capitol, the security elements would consist of hardened versions of the existing

streetscape elements–benches, light poles, etc., with hardened vertical elements set 4 feet on center. There would also be some new elements, such as bus shelters, planters, and bollards.

The Federal Triangle area would have a variety of security elements, based on what was already existing–plinth walls, bollard and rail fences (primarily on the north-south streets), and street furniture, and there would be bollards at the corners, as there would be in all the proposed designs. Some areas, such as the Ronald Reagan Building entrance plaza on 14th Street, would need custom designs.

Constitution Avenue, because of its proximity to the Mall, and its present character of buildings set back within green lawns, would have what was called a "green" development, based on bollards placed in tree-planting beds. Independence Avenue, with its great variety of building styles and several paved plazas in front of the buildings, would receive a more formal green treatment–perhaps based on bollards placed within hedges. Stone benches would be used along both avenues as additional security elements.

On the Mall, low coping walls in front of the museums could often be raised to create a plinth wall or a raised planter element. Entrance points would require custom design, often based on bollards and stone benches. Mr. Toop did not discuss the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the World War II Memorial area or the Jefferson Memorial, because he knew the Commission was already involved with the design of security elements at those sites.

In the West End, along Constitution Avenue and around the State Department, there was a tradition of plinth walls, wide lawns and sidewalks, although the north-streets did not have this and would have to hardened with post and rail or bollard fencing. A number of east-west streets also exhibited a minimum distance between street and building and so would have to be hardened with fencing or bollards, and perhaps with the removal of curb traffic lanes if this was feasible. Entrances to certain buildings, such as the Federal Reserve, would need custom-designed security elements.

In the Southwest Federal Center, predominantly modern buildings exhibited minimum setbacks, few trees, and a lack of pedestrian amenities; improvements in the streetscape were needed generally, as well as increased security. Planters with built-in seating would be the primary solution to both security requirements and pedestrian amenities, and the elimination of curb lanes to provide wider sidewalks would also be considered.

In the downtown area there would be adherence to the District Streetscape Manual, and the BID, Chinatown, George Washington University, and other overlay districts, with the non-hardened elements being replicated as hardened versions.

The Chairman had a comment to make. He observed that the renderings showed, as they usually did, lots of people sitting around talking, etc., and he remarked that people in Washington–even tourists–didn't do much sitting, and so he hoped that the city's streets didn't become "seating wastelands" in the effort to make street furniture double as security elements. Also, he thought the typology applications were very important and should be watched.

Elizabeth Miller was then introduced to discuss the implementation of the project. She said they had broken it down into several divisions, noting that some agencies, such as the departments of State and Justice, had a high risk level, and would probably move quickly to come up with solutions; the same would be true of the Park Service with its monuments. In these cases they would try to provide them with some alternatives to the ever-present bollard. Picking up on the Chairman's mention of typologies, she said they would not want to see each block come with a different solution, and she noted that there were many projects that they considered streetscape projects that would take care of a number of buildings. And there were the north-south streets that would need to be looked at, for example, along Constitution Avenue. Some of the elements proposed would have to be tested to be sure they would work, and, of course, there would be cost estimates that would have

to be made. For 2003, they would be asking for $32 million for the design phase of the priority projects. To help coordinate all the projects they had asked the Federal Lands Division of the Federal Highway Administration to be the lead coordinator, work with each agency, and get the necessary design approvals. She said they had indicated they would be interested in doing this, providing funding could be obtained.

The Vice-Chairman noted that the Washington Monument had not been included, and she was told by Mr. Toop that the major memorials were already being looked at by the Park Service. Mr. Capoccia recalled that Ms. Miller had expressed some concern about agencies proceeding on their own, and he noted that the Commission had already approved many permanent solutions submitted by individual agencies, and some had been implemented. She said many of those were for entrances, not for curb security, and sometimes that was all that was needed. She added that they, too, had already approved a number of both permanent and temporary solutions, and she expected the temporary solutions to be replaced soon by better ones.

The Chairman suggested to Mr. Cogbill that it might be appropriate that the staffs of both this Commission and NCPC set up an internal task force to talk about upcoming projects in the context of this initiative. Mr. Cogbill agreed that would be a good idea, and he noted that both Mr. Atherton and Mr. Lindstrom had participated in their meetings since the beginning of the project, and he had appreciated that. He stressed that they intended to add only those elements they considered essential to protect citizens at street level from vehicle-laden bombs, and that they intended to be respectful of the environment of the capital city. He said there would be a chance for public comments on 4 September, after which a plan of action would be set up; he said he expected they, or the agencies, would be back to the Commission in the near future with proposals .

At this point the Secretary suggested that it might be appropriate to summarize the result of the pre-meeting site inspection of proposed security elements at the Lincoln Memorial so that it could be incorporated into the minutes.

The Chairman agreed, and recalled that there had been long conversations about the nature of the bollards, alternatives to them, and where they would be placed so as to be the least intrusive. He said it was decided to push the perimeter out as far as possible and place the bollards about 4 feet out from the bottom step of the main stair approaching the memorial from the east. Those would be granite bollards; at the north-south roadway approaches metal bollards would be used.

Mr. Cogbill said they would be working with the Park Service on this issue in about a month, and in closing the presentation, said he would like to recognize Mr. Parsons from the Park Service, and Mr. McGill, from GSA, who had been actively involved in the security task force project on behalf of the Planning Commission. Exhibit A

B. National Park Service/American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 18/JUL/02-2, World War II Memorial. 17th Street at the Rainbow Pool. Bas-relief panels and announcement stone. Designs. (Previous: CFA 21/MAR/02-1). The Assistant Secretary asked General P.X. Kelley to begin the presentation. General Kelley said the ABMC had taken the Commission's previous comments about the announcement under advisement and had made some changes that he thought had incorporated the Commission's recommendations. As the architect, Friedrich St. Florian, was out of the country, he had asked Ray Kaskey to present these changes, as well as the other item on the agenda, the twenty-four bas-relief panels he had designed for the 17th Street entrance.

Mr. Kaskey began with the announcement stone, saying that it had been moved from the plaza floor to a position on the coping stone around the Rainbow Pool; this changed it from being

flush with the pavement to a raised position, 30 inches high in the back and 16 inches in the front, giving it more prominence and making it easier to read. It would be 12 feet long and 5 feet wide. He commented that the change had also provided a symbolic link between the old (the Rainbow Pool) and the new (the memorial plaza), and using the Mount Airy granite of the pool made for a more legible lettering than would have been possible using the granite of the plaza. He noted that it had been cantilevered out over a bronze drain grate, giving it a lighter, floating feeling.

The Chairman agreed that the new position had solved a lot of problems, but on second thought, he said the stone really belonged at the entrance, before the visitor entered the precinct, where it would not infringe on the coping of the Rainbow Pool. He said the Commission would like to see Mr. St. Florian consider placing it at the head of the 17th Street stairs, either flush or with a slight cant, so that it would act as a prologue to what would be experienced within the memorial precinct. There was agreement that this should at least be considered, and Mr. Capoccia, as a younger member who had no memories of World War II, said it would increase his understanding of what he was going to see before he entered the memorial proper. Mrs. Nelson commented that some visitors would enter through the north or south pavilions and not see the announcement stone, and the Vice-Chairman agreed that some thought ought to be given to this, and to the people who would come from the parking lot, although she was not advocating multiple announcement stones.

The Chairman observed that walking through the north or south arches and seeing the great eagles there was another experience which would prepare visitors for what they were going to experience, but he felt strongly that the 17th Street entrance, on the east-west axis, was the only place for the announcement stone, and he agreed with Mrs. Rafshoon that interrupting the coping of the pool was not really satisfactory aesthetically. He thought the only thing that had to be decided was whether to set the stone flush in the ground or raise it slightly. He asked John Parsons for his thoughts, and Mr. Parsons said he believed it should be raised, but not as much as had been considered previously; perhaps 6–9 inches in the front and 24 or less at the back. Barry Owenby from the ABMC commented that the location favored by the Chairman was right where the stone had been placed when the memorial design had received final approval in 2000. General Kelley said they would make a model for the Commission to inspect.

Mr. Kaskey then discussed the progress he had made in the design of the bas-reliefs. He began by saying for the record that the bas-reliefs would be in the form of twenty-four separate panels, set into the balustrades on the north and south ceremonial entrance walls of the 17th Street entrance; the panels on the north wall would depict the Atlantic front and those on the south the Pacific front. The unifying theme was the transformation of America by the total immersion into the war effort. He noted that the designs had one formal quality in common–they were all isocephalic; that is, the heads would be lined up equally, like those on the Pension Building frieze. This would be a principle unifying element in the composition, and by putting the emphasis on the people would best express the unity of purpose present in the country at that time.

Mr. Kaskey commented that the members were by now familiar with the content of the panels, which he said were the product of two years study of photos at the National Archives and the Library of Congress; additionally, they had been vetted by the ABMC, military historians, and the various services. In general, they would cover not only military exploits but also the activities of civilians on the homefront. Mr. Kaskey said that as he proceeded to full size maquettes, he would use live models, and the reliefs would benefit from better modeling and a sense of action and liveliness that they did not have at present, since they were based on two-dimensional photographs

Comments on the individual panels were then made by the members, which Mr. Kaskey noted, and the Chairman suggested that they might go to Mr. Kaskey's studio between meetings and

look at the panels when they were further along; Mr. Kaskey agreed that would be a good idea and thought he could show them in groups of three or four.

The Secretary then announced that a request to speak had been received from Judy Scott Feldman, chairman of the National Coalition to Save Our Mall. The Chairman welcomed Ms. Feldman and turned over the floor to her for her comments. Ms. Feldman commented first on how people would arrive at the memorial. She thought that rather than arriving at the 17th Street entrance after a long walk down the Mall, many–especially World War II veterans–would come by taxi, tourbus, tourmobile, or the handicapped parking lot, and would arrive through the north or south pavilions. Therefore, she thought consideration should be given to providing some explanatory words at these entrances. Ms. Feldman commented next on the bas-reliefs. She thought they had more to do with the Atlantic and Pacific oceans than with theatres of operation. Also, she noted that there seemed to be no reference to the Allies anywhere, and she thought that should be corrected. Ms. Feldman's final comment concerned what she still saw as a lack of meaning anywhere in the memorial. She noted that the principal piece of sculpture, which was to have been in the center of the Rainbow Pool, had yet to be presented, and she hoped that when it was, the bas-relief panels, the central sculpture, and the wall of stars would finally make a cohesive statement.

There were some brief comments about Ms. Feldman's remarks, and then Mr. Parsons said for the record that the central sculpture had been removed from consideration, something he assumed all the members knew, but thought was worth repeating just to make sure. In response to the Vice-Chairman's request, he said he would point out to Ms. Feldman the places in the memorial where the Allies were recognized. There was no further discussion or testimony, and General Kelley said the ABMC would take the Commission's comments under consideration and return with a developed scheme for the placement of the announcement stone; Mr. Kaskey's reliefs would be reviewed in his studio. Exhibit B

C. National Park Service

1. CFA 18/JUL/02-3 Tomas Garrigue Masaryk Memorial, Reservation 57, Massachusetts Avenue and 22nd Street, NW. Final. (Previous:CFA 20/JUN/02-2) The Assistant Secretary introduced Milton Cerny, president of the American Friends of the Czech Republic, who in turn introduced landscape architect Jon Pearson from EDAW. Mr. Pearson began by showing a site plan. He pointed out the location of the statue, in a paved plaza centered on Massachusetts Avenue, the background of low plum trees, the national tree of the Czech Republic, and the ground cover (vinca minor) used throughout the planting area, interspersed with perennials. Mr. Pearson noted also the curved wall behind the statue, at the Q Street and 22nd Street corner, with Masaryk's name engraved on the top. He showed drawings of the four granite benches within the plaza area, each divided to keep skateboarders off, and then four views of the statue.

Copies of the inscriptions, incorporating revisions made by the National Czech and Slovak Museum and Library, were passed out. The Vice-Chairman, who had made the request that the inscriptions presented in June be checked for accuracy by experts in Czech history, was still not satisfied, particularly because of the lack of attribution to the author of some of the lines. Mr. Cerny suggested that a blue ribbon panel, possibly headed by Madelyn Albright, the Czech-born former Secretary of State, be asked to make final corrections; since there would be very little time before the 19 September dedication, the inscriptions could be added to the pedestal of the statue at a later date. That was agreeable to everyone, and the final design of the memorial was unanimously approved, with the exception of the inscriptions. Exhibits C, C-1

2. CFA 18/JUL/02-4, Jefferson Memorial, Ohio Drive. Perimeter security barriers. Revised concept. (Previous: CFA 16/MAY/02-2) Staff member José Martínez reported that the security wall proposed to be incorporated into the wing of the memorial itself, as presented to the Commission in May, would not provide enough protection for the memorial or the people visiting it. The security people had asked for a wider perimeter, and so the Park Service was returning with three other options. John Parsons was introduced, and in answer to the Chairman's question, said that landscape architect Laurie Olin, who had presented the previous design, was not involved in these new alternatives. Mr. Parsons said that, in fact, the new design had come about from comments the Chairman had made in May in regard to an alternate solution in the event that Mr. Olin's wall was determined not to provide enough protection. Mr. Parsons introduced landscape architect Jeff Lee from Lee & Liu, who asked architect Michael Broderick from McKissack & McKissack to begin the presentation.

Mr. Broderick said they had studied the Park Service's Cultural Landscapes Report, the Olmsted original landscape report, and the plan eventually agreed upon between Olmsted and the Commission of Fine Arts around 1941. As the inner ring road was not considered adequate from a security point of view, it gave them a chance to look at the whole site. He said their biggest opportunity now was to get rid of the parking lot on the south side; this plus the presence of I-395 just beyond guaranteed that the entire south side of the memorial precinct was dominated by the automobile.

Mr. Lee said they looked at circulation patterns and the way people used the site, and they decided that if the parking were removed, the vehicular circulation could become pedestrian circulation, making the whole arrival, approach, and ascent to the memorial an important pedestrian experience. He observed that while the north and south vistas were the critical ones in the original design, attention had also been given to the east and west, especially to the open meadow areas on each side and the views from the memorial out over the meadows, and so all four sides had to be looked at in terms of the improvement of visitor experience as well as security.

Mr. Lee said two options had presented themselves. The first option was to provide a vehicle barrier, in the form of the ever-present bollard, at the outer edge of the memorial's ring road. If used, they would try to place them so they seemed to be there to protect pedestrians from vehicles–the original people-friendly purpose of the bollard. The second option was to provide a vehicle barrier in the form of a wall further out along East Basin Drive, which would provide greater protection but because of its length could easily become monotonous; it could also detract from Olmsted's pastoral landscape plan. There were two approaches to this option: one was to protect Olmsted's landscape as much as possible and keep the barrier as unobtrusive as possible; the other was to think like Olmsted might have had he been presented with the present security environment, and integrate the security elements within the landscape. This approach would be more elaborate and would use slight berms, low walls, and swales, as well as entrance nodes, corresponding to the pedestrian walks and paths, that would act as "events" along East Basin Drive. Landscaping that would not interfere with the meadows or the views would be added at the entrance nodes and within the swales themselves, or the swales could be filled with stones. Drawings of several possibilities for these elements were shown.

The Chairman asked Mr. Parsons where visitors would park their cars when the parking lot was removed. He was told there was a designated lot between the 14th Street bridges, a very short distance away. There was general agreement that the parking lot should be removed, especially if NCPC's plan to put the bridges in a tunnel ever came to pass and the south vista was restored. However, Mrs. Rafshoon thought the location of the handicapped parking should be looked at again, because those eight spaces would be highly visible, all lined up close to the street, more so than at

present within the existing parking lot. Mr. Broderick said he was in complete agreement and would look at ways to get them off the axis, perhaps separating them, four on each side.

The Chairman then commented on the idea of the entrance nodes and thought they deserved further study. Mr. Capoccia agreed, adding that the swales seemed to be the most respectful way to introduce a barrier and yet preserve the pastoral landscape. The concept design was given unanimous approval, but before moving on to the next item, the Chairman recognized Judy Scott Feldman, who had asked to comment.

Ms. Feldman asked that some parking be kept, as the Jefferson Memorial was so hard to reach by foot; she said it was her favorite memorial, but she was afraid she would never take another family member or guest there because of the lack of parking. Mr. Parsons said it was a three and one half minute walk from the existing parking lots near the bridges, about the same as from Ohio Drive to the FDR Memorial. He thought the benefit was worth the slight inconvenience, and the Chairman agreed. Exhibit D

3. CFA 18/JUL/02-5, Federal Reserve Board, William M. Martin Building, C Street and Virginia Avenue, NW. Temporary sculpture exhibition. Staff member Sue Kohler said this was another in the Federal Reserve's temporary sculpture program, and called for the installation of sculptor Wendy Ross's semi-abstract metal sculpture, *Bloom*. She recalled that the Commission had approved other abstract works by Ms. Ross, as well as her realistic sculpture of George Mason for inclusion in the George Mason Memorial. The members had received photographs of the work in their pre-meeting packages and had no objection, but Mrs. Nelson wondered if there might be a problem with leaves and trash collecting in the sculpture. The Assistant Secretary assured her the Federal Reserve had an excellent maintenance program, and with that assurance, the installation was unanimously approved. Exhibit E

(The agenda order was changed, and the items under II.G taken up next.)

G. Department of the Treasury/U.S. Mint

1. CFA 18/JUL/02-9, George W. Bush Bronze Presidential Medal. Design

Ms. Kohler reported that the Mint had asked that this submission be postponed , as the design for the medal was not ready.

2. CFA 18/JUL/02-10, General Henry H. Shelton Congressional Gold Medal. Design. Ms. Kohler recalled that the members had received this design in their pre-meeting packages, but she showed them a more fully developed rendition of the portrait on the obverse, and all agreed that it was a better likeness of the General. There were no objections to the obverse design nor to the reverse, which combined a depiction of a parachutist with an inscription; both sides were then unanimously approved. Exhibit F

(The Commission adjourned for lunch at 12:15 p.m. and reconvened at 12:40 p.m.)

D. General Services Administration

CFA 18/JUL/02-6, D.C. Court of Appeals (Old City Hall) and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Judiciary Square, southwest corner at Indiana Avenue and 5th Street,

NW. New shared underground parking facility. Concept - Phase I. The Assistant Secretary introduced Mike McGill from GSA to begin the presentation. Mr. McGill said this was a proposal to eliminate surface parking from Judiciary Square and replace it with an underground facility that would be shared by the D.C. Court of Appeals and the U.S. court of Military Appeals. He asked architect Enrique Bellini from KCCT to discuss the conceptual design.

Mr. Bellini said the garage would accommodate 271 vehicles on three levels, with 50 of the spaces to be for the Court of Military Appeals. It would be independent of but associated with the proposed modernization of the old D.C. Courthouse (originally City Hall) for use by the D.C. Court of Appeals. Although at first combined, the projects were separated so that the garage could be constructed under a design/build schedule and completed by 2004. The modernization of the landmark court building would proceed in the traditional design and construction pattern and would be completed in 2007.

The garage would occupy the land to the west of the old courthouse, and the only surface features would be the entrance and a structure for ventilation and egress. Any other surface features would be done as part of the modernization of the old courthouse. Mr. Bellini noted that the existing Darlington Fountain would be stored until the park above the garage was completed and then returned to its place. The Chairman observed that the statue of Alexander Shepherd had been removed from its location (in front of the District Building) many years ago and was still in storage, and so he thought any approval the Commission gave for this project would have to be predicated on the return of the Darlington Fountain to its rightful place.

Mr. Bellini then turned to the proposed design of the garage entrance. He said it would be a landscape solution in order to minimize its impact on the view of the historic courthouse from Indiana Avenue and to maintain the soft green character of the proposed park. This would be accomplished by the installation of two tiers of planters, faced in the same limestone as the courthouse, above the entrance ramp, which would be entered from D Street. Incorporated into the entrance would be an elevator and stair tower. A structure to accommodate ventilation and emergency egress would be placed at the northwest corner of the grounds; it would be treated as a garden pavilion, but it would be 22-feet high to the top of the wall, which was of some concern to the members. Mr. Bellini agreed it was tall, but said there was nothing they could do about it as it was required by code. Concern was also expressed about the appearance of the raised planting area over the garage, and questions were asked about ways in which it could be lowered. Mr. Bellini said they needed three feet of earth over the garage roof to grow any plant material, and he explained by showing drawings why he could not push the planting area any lower.

Mr. Capoccia made a comment about the relocation of the Darlington Fountain, and Mr. Bellini said that, unfortunately, they did not control the final design of the park. He said GSA and the courts had divided the project into two parts; as the garage was a design/build project, they dealt only with the minimum entrance and surface features. He said they might not be the architects for the entire court project, and GSA wanted whoever was chosen to be free to proceed with his own design. The Chairman observed that it had already been limited by Mr. Bellini's raised planting area over the garage. There was a discussion with Mr. McGill about the entire process, which was complicated by the fact that both a federal and a District government court were involved, and because of the desire to get started with the parking garage as soon as possible for security reasons.

The Chairman asked if there was a master plan for the entire area that would give the Commission an idea of what was intended. Mr. McGill said that as far as he knew, neither the master plan for Judiciary Square, nor the conceptual plan for the D.C. courts restoration was ready. Mr. Bellini replied that the master plan was nearly complete and should be ready for review by the courts and GSA soon. In answer to a question from Mrs. Brody, he said there were no competing

uses for the parking garage space, and, in fact, there would probably be another similar garage on the east side of the courthouse, so that all surface parking on Judiciary Square related to the courts would disappear. Mrs. Brody thought it might be a good idea, if practical, for the Commission to wait until the master plan was finished before taking any action. The Chairman commented that three underground facilities were being proposed for the area, all with elements on top (this would include the proposed Law Enforcement Memorial Museum; see below) and he was concerned about these and the curb cuts; he, too, thought the Commission should wait and look at the master plan–even if it was just an informal presentation. Mr. Sanchez from the D.C. courts asked to comment, saying that he could have the master plan in a couple of weeks. The Chairman said they could look at it with the staff at that time, and Mr. Bellini said it would then be possible to discuss both the master plan and the parking garage at the September meeting.

No action was taken, pending the Commission's review of the master plan. Exhibit G

E. National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund

CFA 18/JUL/02-7, National Law Enforcement Museum, Judiciary Square (Federal Reservation #7), E Street between Court Buildings E and C, and north of Old City Hall (Old Courthouse). Concept–design guidelines. Mr. Martínez said the museum was proposed for the area north of the courthouse and south of E Street; there was no design proposed at this time, but it would be an underground facility, probably with two above-ground pavilions to provide entry and egress from the museum. He introduced architect Davis Buckley to make the presentation.

Mr. Buckley began by giving the members some historical information on Judiciary Square and Old City Hall, at present a District courthouse. He said it was Washington's first municipal building, designed by George Hadfield in 1820; a wing was added in 1826 (another in 1829) and a rear addition in 1881. (The building became a courthouse in 1873.) Mr. Buckley then described how he designed the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, beginning in 1987, and how, when the Memorial Foundation was making plans to add a museum, they discovered that the D.C. courts intended to build on the site north of the Old Courthouse, which the Law Enforcement Memorial people had been looking at for an underground museum. An accommodation was made, and he said the site would be divided between the two parties. The Law Enforcement Museum would occupy the part of the site abutting E Street, and would have use of the area under E Street; the courts would use the area adjoining their building.

Mr. Buckley said they had agreed not to interfere with the vista between the Pension Building and the Old Courthouse, and the two pavilions they planned to erect for access would be located to each side of the 100-foot visual easement, and would not compete, architecturally, with any of the historic buildings along the vista. He described the memorial as an entity separate from the museum, a sister component, one of two complementary elements within the easement area.

On the museum site, within the visual easement area, there would be an upper terrace at the south, looking north over the memorial and to the Pension Building, and a lower terrace between the two pavilions. The pavilions would be set back 20 feet from the court buildings to the east and west. Mr. Buckley said he didn't know yet how the transition between the upper and lower terraces would be made, as that was part of the design process.

Turning to the pavilions themselves, he said they should not mimic the architecture of the surrounding buildings; they should be jewel-like and transparent, and there should be as little mechanical equipment on the roofs as possible. He said the pavilions would screen the loading and service areas and clearly define the museum entries. He commented that the entries would not take the visitor on a long escalator or elevator ride, that the first level below ground would be reached

quickly, and the visitor would find himself in an atrium space that would ease the transition from the surface to the below-ground spaces.

Mr. Buckley then discussed the topographical and landscape aspects of the museum site. He said that like the memorial site, the museum site was lower on the east side, and as they wanted the plaza to appear level, they would use visual devices similar to those used at the memorial–steps and other methods of transition–to make it appear level. Turning to the landscape considerations, he said first that the landscape architect would be Jim Urban, who had also done the landscaping for the memorial. Although he said he had not discussed it at length with Mr. Urban, it was his feeling that the landscape for the museum site had to be quite different from that used for the memorial. He thought it should be a "complementary opposite solution"

Mrs. Nelson asked if there had been any consideration of entering the museum from the Metro station with a tunnel under the street so that people would not have to contend with the E Street traffic. Mr. Buckley said it would not be possible because it was prohibited by WMATA and would be extraordinarily expensive. Also, he did not like the idea of going underground to enter an underground museum; he thought there was something special about entering at grade, keeping the relationship of the memorial to the museum, and retaining the visual ambiance of the open vista Mr. Capoccia asked about the height of the pavilions and was told it would be 25 feet–the maximum allowed by the legislation. He asked also how the mechanical equipment necessary for the size of the museum could be housed anywhere other than the roofs of the pavilions; Mr. Buckley said their engineers were exploring ways to do this–possibly on the sides or within the underground structure. The Chairman asked Mr. Buckley if he had had access to the master plan the Commission had requested, and Mr. Buckley said he had not. Mr. Robinson then said he presumed from what Mr. Buckley had said that there would be no access to the museum from the memorial precinct. Mr. Buckley said that was correct. He said the courts had asked him to consider it, but when they looked at the possibilities, they realized it would be difficult and ponderous, especially because of the ramps and elevators. He said it could not help but diminish the effect of the memorial, as it would take up much of the open space to the south. The Chairman then asked him if he considered the memorial complete, and he said he did, and he felt very strongly about it. He said he would be back in November, and Mrs. Brody asked him if could use the time to see if he could get some information from the courts as to what the above-grade renovation would look like; she thought its effect on the museum site plaza was something that should be discussed. Exhibit H

F. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

CFA 18/JUL/02-8, John F. Kennedy for the Performing Arts. New exterior lighting scheme. Design. (Previous: CFA 16/MAY/02-4) The Assistant Secretary commented that he and the Secretary had met Mrs. Rafshoon and the Chairman on the site the previous evening and reviewed a revised mock-up of the new lighting scheme. He introduced the lighting designer, Ray Grenald, to discuss the outcome.

Mr. Grenald recalled that he had been requested after the previous mock-up to warm up the lights, reduce the brightness and make the light more uniform, as well as illuminate the tops of the columns. He thought they had done what was requested, but asked if there were any questions. Mrs. Rafshoon had no questions but said she was impressed with the way the warm light washed the walls, and the new lighting of the columns. She said she would move approval on the condition that the Commission could work with the Kennedy Center on setting the light intensity on the columns, and that there be a rheostat for each of the sides so that they could be adjusted. This was agreeable

to the Chairman and the other members, and the revised lighting scheme was unanimously approved. Exhibit I

H. Smithsonian Institution/National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue, NW, new entrance gates and lion sculptures. Concept. Mr. Martínez said he and the Secretary had met with the Zoo staff to look at mockups and recalled that photographs had been sent to the members in their pre-meeting packages. He introduced Michelle Kayon to discuss this project.

Ms. Kayon said the project had come about when they were contacted about the old concrete Taft Bridge lions that had been replaced by new ones. She said they were not in good enough condition for the zoo to take them, but the sculptor, Reinaldo Lopez, said he could make new bronze replicas using the form work of the new concrete lions. She said they had been able to find a donor who would pay for them. She said the plan was to put them flanking the pedestrian entrance to the zoo on a 3-foot-high base, the height having been worked out in conjunction with the Commission staff. She said placing them higher, as they were on the bridge, did not work in this location where they would be seen at pedestrian height. To keep children from climbing them, there would be a low curb with prickly planting behind it. The base would be concrete with chamfered corners. The sculptor was then introduced.

Mr. Lopez said that while working on the Taft Bridge lions he had investigated sculptor Roland Hinton Perry's intentions in regard to material and found out that he originally intended to do them in bronze; however, the money was not available, and they were cast in concrete, the material of the bridge. Mr. Lopez wanted to make the new lions in bronze, which would cost only slightly more than concrete, but the city wanted to use the original material. The molds for the new concrete lions were made available to the zoo, which wanted bronze replicas, and he produced them with a minimum of effort, since the molds had been made. He said they had come out extremely well, and he hoped the city would see what they had missed.

Ms. Kayon then discussed the new entrance gates briefly, saying they would be exact replicas of the existing iron, swinging gates, but made of aluminum; and they would slide, to avoid the appearance of two caged lions. The members were pleased with both the sculpture and the gates, and although submitted as a concept design, both were given final approval. Exhibit J

1. CFA 18/JUL/02-12, Farm Exhibit, Olmsted Walk near the Beach Drive entrance. Final. (Previous: CFA 19/JUL/01-7 Mr. Martínez recalled the earlier concept submission and said the zoo's architect was back with final details; he introduced Michelle Kayon to discuss them. Ms. Kayon said the exhibit would be in an area of the zoo that was seldom used and filled with ponds. The theme of the exhibit would be "Where does our food come from?", and it would be aimed at three-to eight-year-olds; therefore, the explanation of a very complicated subject would employ the imagery of a storybook farm. She described the pizza garden, the duck and chicken houses, the cow exhibit, and the miniature donkeys and goats–all meant to get across the message that animals must be cared for, and that farming was more complex than it appeared in this exhibit. Inside the barn the children would be helped in performing various care and feeding tasks. At the end there would be a staff house, with a classroom, offices, and restroom facilities for the staff and the public. The latter had been requested by the Commission during the concept review.

Mark Rengel then described the materials for the various structures. The farm buildings would be red with a plywood siding in a fake board and batten pattern and white trim; roofs would be metal in a galvanized grey color. The farmhouse would be pale yellow with white trim and a shingle roof. Ms. Kayon said there were three areas where elements might have to be eliminated for

budget reasons. One was a ramp that would connect the picnic pavilion with a play area and a picnic area; the second also involved a ramp, this one from the upper area down to the staff house; Ms. Kayon said there were other ways to reach both these destinations. The third element was a theatre where the children could watch a video about egg production. This would become a landscaped area, and the video would be shown at the silo, where a video about corn production would also be shown.

The Vice-Chairman asked what kind of surface would be used for the play area. Ms. Kayon said it would be a solid material in a palette of colors; in most areas it would be a mixture of colors that would blend in with the ground. Mrs. Nelson asked about the durability of the marine plywood being used and was told that it would be covered and sealed with a durable synthetic material. There were no more questions, and the final design was unanimously approved. Exhibit J

I. Department of the Navy

CFA 18/JUL/02-13, Defense Intelligence Analysis Center. Bolling Air Force Base, Luke Avenue and Chappie James Boulevard, SE. New building/addition. Final. (Previous: CFA 18/OCT/01-2). The Assistant Secretary said this would be the final review for this sizeable addition, and he recalled that the Commission had given the design concept approval in October 2001. He introduced Gene Washington from the Navy, who in turn introduced Cynthia Johnson, chief architect for the project, from the Smith Group, to make the presentation.

Ms. Johnson first recalled some of the analysis of the site that she had presented before–the importance of the views into and from the site, the prominence of the site itself, and the importance of features within the Air Force Base that they wanted to respect as well as respond to: the main entrance gate, the historic headquarters building, the view shed out to the Potomac, and the strong green of the parade ground, which terminated at the site for their new addition building.

Ms. Johnson said two significant changes had been made to the concept design: the strong north-south axis of the parade ground had been extended and used as the circulation spine for the entire project. The visitors center had been turned 90 degrees from where it had been, in order to stress this axis, and that had enabled them to incorporate a major water feature at the building's entrance, the second major design change.

The water feature was actually a part of the security considerations incorporated into the project. She said the site force protection had been achieved in the existing building by surrounding it with an earth berm, with a more steeply sloping inverse berm on the back side. This would be extended around the new building as well, but the problem was with the kind of moat that was created–the security people did not want any trees or large shrubs planted in it, and that made it difficult to create any kind of traditional setting for the building. They had come up with the water feature as an answer to the problem, feeling that it would add some interest and help modulate the long facade.

Ms. Johnson then discussed the architectural elements of the building. She said one of its major features was its function as a focal point, reinforcing the north-south axis. To that end they had wanted to incorporate a large entrance portal, and this had ended up as a four-story, transparent "hole" in the building–actually a four-story entrance atrium that would open up the building.

The facades were discussed next, with Ms. Johnson saying that the aluminum and glass used on the original building would be carried over to the new one, with the north facade , which faced the existing structure, closer in its disposition of these materials and in the organization of its elements to the older building than was the south facade. This facade, the more public one, had a higher proportion of glass and was more highly articulated in an attempt to minimize its length..

There would be a large, cantilevered bay from the second to the fifth floors, and a smaller projection marking the conference center facilities. A recessed bay would accommodate a large drum form, which housed the secondary elevators. It would be sheathed in a stainless steel with an orange peel texture and a slight sheen. The end elevations would feature a horizontally-ribbed metal panel in the middle to reconcile the differences in the north and south facades. It would have a slight bluish color and would also be used for the penthouse screen and for the ovoid-shaped covering for the cooling tower. Ms. Johnson showed samples of other materials–the basic metal panel, tinted office glazing, clear glass for the atrium, a ceramic frit glass with a slight texture and pattern for the conference facilities, and Blue Pearl granite for the small amount of stone at the base of the building.

Mr. Capoccia congratulated Ms. Johnson on her design and said he found it very beautiful–except for the bollards–and hoped she could find a way to eliminate them. She said they had a requirement to stop a vehicle threat away from the building and still needed them in spite of the berms with a low stone wall at the top. Mrs. Rafshoon suggested looking at concealing them in a hedge, and Ms. Johnson said she was going to investigate that; also, the water feature, if deep enough, might allow them to get by without bollards.

There were no more questions. The Chairman and the other members were very pleased with the final design, and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit K

J. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 02-256, Georgetown University, 3700 O Street, NW. Ryan Administration Building. MBNA Performing Arts Center addition. Revised concept. (Previous: O.G. 02-79, last seen CFA 21 March 2002) Mr. Martínez recalled that the Commission had seen two other versions of this design, and each had been approved in concept; this new scheme had also been approved by the Georgetown Board and the concept design was being recommended for approval. He said the different designs had been the result of different conditions at the university as to the amount of money available for the project. The design to be presented at this meeting would incorporate an expanded program and would delete the patterned brick shown in the previous version. He noted that the Old Georgetown Board had asked for further study of the south window wall, which had been an element of the design from the original concept, and then introduced Lee Allen from the university, who introduced architect Stuart Jones from Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates.

Mr. Jones said that the performance spaces were at the heart of the previous scheme (which had been cut down considerably from the first scheme) and they were largely unchanged in this scheme. He noted that because of the simplicity of these forms, the design consisted essentially of a group of boxes of various configurations arranged around an existing building and treated in a contemporary manner. Now, with an increased interest in making this more of a teaching facility, and with the promise of additional funds from a donor, more spaces for teaching, rehearsal, design studios, etc. had been added, changing the design a third time. The Ryan Building would still be used as the entrance and for a public area before entering the main, 230-seat theatre. A smaller studio theatre below–there was a steep grade on the site, front to rear–would be accessed by a public space at the side of the building. Also down at the lower level would be costume and scene shops as well as rehearsal shops. These additions had changed the exterior design because they had increased the possibility and the need for windows. He noted especially the zig-zag form of the south window, intended to add more shadow and depth, and the north facade, with some of the

architectural elements derived from the Ryan building but used in a contemporary way. He said the building would be primarily brick, probably in several different colors, and they would use that in ways to add depth, light and shadow, too. The Vice-Chairman had several questions for Mr. Jones regarding the windows and the sense of theatricality, which she thought was essential to the building. There was no further discussion, and the revised concept design was approved, with the request that the architect take into consideration the comments made by the members regarding the elevations, particularly the fenestration. Exhibit L

b. O.G. 02-215, Dumbarton Oaks, 1703 32nd Street, NW. New library and service buildings and landscape alterations. (Previous: O.G. 02-135, last seen CFA 21 March 2002. Mr. Martínez read the Georgetown Board's report on this project, which noted that the board had reviewed revisions to the design in June and July, following the Commission's review and comments at the March meeting. Acknowledgment was made of the architects' attempts to introduce a sloping roof, following the Commission's recommendations, but thought that their principal objections, that the design did not "relate the scale of the building to the existing structures and landscape of the historic Dumbarton Oaks campus had not been adequately addressed." The entire report is attached to these minutes as Exhibit M

Dr. Ned Keenan, director of Dumbarton Oaks, was introduced and in turn introduced members of the design team and of the Dumbarton Oaks staff. He said he had not seen the Georgetown Board's report, but he thought the Commission would see that they had been almost entirely responsive to the recommendations. He mentioned the sloped roof, enlarged and extended terraces and use of a darker stone to relate more to other nearby surfaces. He thought the apparent height had been reduced by changing the base from a light-colored limestone to a darker stone, and he said the scale and details had been studied to try to relate them to the existing buildings. He commented that although they were showing elevations, the building would be only barely visible from public space. He introduced landscape architect Jim Urban to give an overview of the landscape context of the building.

Mr. Urban described the various parts of the Dumbarton Oaks campus, noting that one-third was not accessible to the public, and describing the changes in grade throughout the complex. He said Dumbarton Oaks was really about landscape as architecture, and the way buildings and landscape were married was absolutely critical; he thought that was the focus of the changes to the library they had been working on in the last month. One of the biggest changes to the building was that it had become much more horizontal; he thought the change in materials at the mid-level, to make it appear as a two-story building on a two-story base, was critical to the marriage. The second important change was that the building had become straighter, and the terraces had become a little wider and greener as well as a little darker because of the use of the grey stone. All of these changes would make the building look smaller and more wedded to the landscape.

Mr. Urban then showed the progression, on a drawing, from the service court to the pathway through the dell, then the arrival into the library area along the south side of the building through a narrow passageway between the gardener's cottage and the building to the entrance, and then across the service court to the refectory. He said this movement was always anticipated by landscape architect Beatrix Ferrand but was never really completed.

Dan McCoubrey, from the Venturi Scott-Brown office, described in more detail the changes mentioned by Dr. Keenan and Mr. Urban, noting also the smaller scale of the windows, achieved by the pattern of the muntins.

The Chairman commented that the design had come a long way since the Commission had first seen it, noting especially the cues that had been taken from the family of roofs and windows

seen at Dumbarton Oaks. He thought using stone for the first story had been effective in overcoming the idea that it was a three-story building, which would only become apparent when viewed from the dell. The Vice-Chairman asked if it was true that the building would not be seen from the street for most of the year. Mr. McCoubrey said he thought that was a fair statement There was a discussion of the darker diamond patterning on the wall facing the service court, which had been simplified from the way it appeared in the original design. Mrs. Nelson did not like it, but the Vice-Chairman did, finding it original and typical of Mr. Venturi's work. Mr. McCoubrey said they would do a large-scale mockup to bring out the actual differences in color, and he said it would be subtle, not as contrasty as it appeared in the drawing.

Mrs. Brody was asked for her comments, and she said she really did not feel comfortable with the design, as she had with the first design the Commission had seen, by architects Hartman-Cox. She was particularly uncomfortable with the massiveness of the stone base and with the window treatment. She also had difficulty with the patterning of the brick and thought it needed further study; she found it particularly jarring against the coolhouse building. In response to Mrs. Brody's comments on the base, Mr. McCoubrey said they would actually prefer to bring it down and not have so much stone. The Vice-Chairman asked if there were any other changes they were unhappy with. Mr. McCoubrey said Mr. Venturi did not like the pitched roof and would prefer the clerestory roof first presented

Mrs. Rafshoon commented on the very special charm of the site and the gardens, and she thought this design was not compatible with the rest of the campus. Mr. Capoccia said he found the first of Mr. Venturi's designs quite handsome, and in answer to the Chairman's question, Mrs. Rafshoon said she would have to agree that it was more unique. Mrs. Nelson found the revised design schizophrenic in that it was better in some ways but worse in others, and she thought this was what happened with people-pleasing.

At this point Barbara Zartman, former ANC commissioner, now representing the Citizens Association of Georgetown, asked to comment. She said she had advocated the original, underground design, but commented that the Citizens Association had supported the second design by Hartman-Cox when it appeared. Mr. Venturi's design, however, had not won over her colleague on the ANC, nor others who had considered it. She said just about everything at Dumbarton Oaks was magical, especially the dell, and this design came up wanting when compared to the standard set by the original buildings and garden. She said she spoke for the board of directors of the Citizens Association when she asked the Commission to support "simply the highest, the best, the most special for this remarkable piece of property."

The Vice-Chairman made a motion that the revised scheme just presented be disapproved and the first plan reconsidered, since so many of the members had not been present when the first scheme was presented. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Mr. McCoubrey said he had drawings that had been slightly modified from the first presentation, and the members examined them. The Vice-Chairman commented on the changes that Philip Johnson's Pre-Columbian art pavilion had brought to Dumbarton Oaks, and she commented that the next iteration should do the same thing, that it should be a building that "animates both the informed and the wanting to be informed public of a center that is based on ideas fundamentally, that has new ideas." She asked what accommodations could be made to the original design that would not compromise it, and there was a discussion between Mr. McCoubrey and the members that ended with the Chairman asking for a motion that the architect and client be asked to consider the first design in the context of the Commission's and the Georgetown Board's concerns and then come back with a presentation that addressed those concerns. The Vice-Chairman made the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Capoccia and carried unanimously. Exhibit M-1

c. Appendix I. The Vice-Chairman had some questions about a sidewalk café at 3251 Prospect Street (O.G. 02-240), saying she wanted to be sure it was what it purported to be and was temporary. Mr. Martínez explained that it was mostly on private property, but they would have to go through zoning, and as it was only a concept, it would also have to have a permit review. At this point, the Georgetown Board thought the sloping canvas roof would enliven the building and the street.

The Georgetown Appendix, Appendix I, was then approved without objection.

(The Shipstead-Luce Appendix was discussed next.)

J.2.b., Appendix II. The Assistant Secretary commented on several changes to the Appendix. The first, S.L. 02-049, had been determined not to be within the Shipstead area and was referred to the D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board. The second, S.L. 02-097, 601 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, concerned a six-foot-wide dish antennae that, in its proposed location, would have been visible from just about everywhere in the monumental core. It was recommended that it be moved to the north side of the building. The third, S.L. 02-101, 2131 Yorktown Road, NW, had been superseded by a permit application, S.L. 02-106, for an addition, to which there were no objections. The last change was an addition to the Appendix, S.L. 02-105, a sidewalk café at 215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, for the Firehook Bakery. There were no objections to it.

The Shipstead-Luce Appendix was then approved without objection.

(The Commission then turned to the last item on the agenda. The Vice-Chairman and Mrs. Brody left the meeting at this point.)

J.2.a. S.L. 02-102, Arena Stage, 1101 Sixth Street, SW. Additions, alterations, and reconfiguration. Concept. The Assistant Secretary stated for the record that the members had made a pre-meeting site inspection, touring the entire present Arena Stage complex. The need for expansion was evident, and he said the project to be reviewed included major alterations and additions to the property. He introduced Steven Richard, executive director of Arena Stage, and Christopher Doray, the lead architect from Bing Thom, Architects, the designer of the project. He asked Mr. Richard to begin the presentation.

In response to the Chairman's comments that several members would have to leave very soon, Mr. Richard said he would turn the presentation over to Mr. Doray for a discussion on the proposed design. Mr. Doray's first comments concerned improved access to the complex. He noted that the Dwight Eisenhower Freeway (I-395) north of the site cut all access from the north, with the exception of 4th Street, and he said that the future "front door" would remain essentially where it was, on 6th Street, but with the expected development of the waterfront along Maine Avenue, there would be an additional entry there, at the northwest corner, or apex, of the triangular site. The apex, Mr. Doray noted, pointed towards the Washington Monument. He said that in Washington, where landmarks were built by the week, they thought it would be a good idea to associate their project with one of them and had picked the Monument! He said the proximity of the river had brought about the concept of uniting all parts of the complex by surrounding them with a water garden, which would begin with a waterfall at the point of entry off Maine Avenue. He recalled that Bing Thom had used a similar concept for a project at the Seville Expo.

Mr. Doray said the Arena complex would increase from 80,000 to 108,000 square feet, and the challenge was to tie together the three venues–the Fichandler Theatre, the Kreeger Theatre, and the new element, called the Experimental Theatre–also called by the architects "the cradle" and sometimes "the egg" because of its form. He pointed out that these three elements existed at very different levels within the water garden. He showed a slide of the roof, which he compared to a compass needle, saying that it had been fashioned in such a way that it would point to the Washington Monument on the north. The shape of the roof would coincide with the curvilinear aspect of Maine Avenue as it changed from straight to curving as it entered M Street. He showed several model slides, pointing out Maine Avenue and saying that the bosque of trees along the street would be maintained because of the rich foliage; the roof would appear just over the trees and would appear as a canopy, with everything under it transparent and light. The "Cradle" would create a small hump in the roof and there would also be skylights to light the interior spaces–even an open one over an open-air terrace. He commented that the Cradle was actually structural and stabilized the roof. Mr. Doray continued to show slides of all aspects of the complex, pointing out the location of greatly expanded service facilities and auxiliary spaces, such as rehearsal halls and dressing rooms, as well as an 80-car underground parking garage, with access from Maine Avenue and 6th Street.

The Chairman asked to see a section from Maine Avenue; Mr. Doray showed him that, and also one through the Cradle and through the other theatres. After he had finished showing his slides, Mr. Doray took the members over to a model, where he talked about the structure, commenting that the space frame and columns would all be made of recycled wood. There would be no ducts, as the columns would act as ducts for the mechanical and electrical systems. He said there would be at least a 5-foot clerestory, which would make the enormous, and very heavy, roof appear light. Mrs. Nelson asked what material was being considered for the Cradle. Mr. Doray said that had not yet been decided, but it would definitely represent current or future time–at present it ranged from zinc to titanium.

Mrs. Rafshoon commented that this would be a huge attraction, and Mr. Richard said the city thought so, too, and had agreed to put $25 million into the project, as a way of jumpstarting the Southwest redevelopment.

There was unanimous agreement that the project was very exciting, and the members all looked forward to further submissions. Exhibit N

There being no further submissions, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. Cogbill:

The Commission was pleased to see you during its meeting of 18 July for the informational presentation on the draft National Capital Urban Design and Security Plan. The members appreciate the extended effort of the Security Task Force and all the participants during the past year of this initiative. No one will contest the necessity for improved perimeter security at our government's facilities, nor deny our desire to improve the city's appearance, already compromised by many unsightly and poorly thought-out installations. The challenge is to encourage the development of plans that are creative, contextual, and preserve the openness for which our city is known.

The Commission and its staff will continue our work with you and the staff and consultants of the National Capital Planning Commission to review and guide the individual schemes for perimeter security installations as they are developed for implementation. It is unfortunate that we live in a time when such measures have become a fact of life and a routine necessity. Our coordinated effort to address these issues is well warranted.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

John V. Cogbill, III
Chairman
National Capital Planning Commission
401 9th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20576

cc: Richard L. Friedman, Commissioner, NCPC
Patricia E. Gallagher, NCPC

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

5 August 2002

Dear General Kelley:

During its meeting of 18 July, the Commission reviewed the story boards for the 24 bas-relief panels that are to line the east entrance walls of the World War II Memorial and, with several minor changes, approved Mr. Kaskey's sketches for further development. As Mr. Kaskey creates the clay maquettes the members would like to be able to review each panel before they are sent to the foundry for casting.

In addition, the members reviewed the design and location of the memorial's announcement stone. The members felt that the stone as proposed was too reminiscent of the cenotaph that was eliminated from previous plans for the memorial. It was recommended that the stone's location be moved from the edge of the pool in the plaza to the top of the stairs at the17th Street entrance. Design options for height and angle of the stone's face and subsequently, a full scale mockup of the stone, with the inscription lettering, was requested to better assess its configuration and placement. It would be beneficial to have both this mockup and the mockup of the wall of stars available for inspection at the same time.

The Commission looks forward to reviewing the bas-relief panels and the on-site mockups as soon as they are ready. The staff is available to coordinate site visits and to assist you and the design team should questions arise.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

General Paul X. Kelley, USMC (Ret.)
Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission
Courthouse Plaza II, Suite 501
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201

cc: Terry Carlstrom, National Park Service
John Parsons, National Park Service
William Barry Owenby, ABMC
General John Herrling, ABMC

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

The Commission reviewed, at its 18 July meeting, the final landscape design for the Tomas G. Masaryk Memorial to be placed in Reservation 57, located at the intersection of Massachusetts Avenue and 22nd Street, NW. The submission was approved with the exception of the quotations to be inscribed on the sides of the sculpture's pedestal. It was thought that they had a significant potential for misinterpretation and were not approved. The members requested these two inscriptions be reconsidered and vetted through an independent panel of experts in Czech history. As stated in our last letter, words etched in stone are difficult and costly to correct. If the inscriptions cannot be finalized by the time of the dedication, we recommend the sculpture and pedestal be installed without the inscriptions, to be engraved at a later date. If new quotations are selected before the memorial's dedication, they can be forwarded to the staff to circulate to the members and acted on as soon as possible before the dedication.

Please send the new or revised quotations to the staff when ready and they will circulate them to the members for approval, or resubmit them by 5 September for consideration at our next meeting on 19 September. The staff is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Mr. Terry Carlstrom
Regional Director, National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, DC 20242

cc: Jakub Slalník, Embassy of the Czech Republic
Milton Cerny, American Friends of the Czech Republic
Jan H. Pokorny, New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission
Roger Courtenay, EDAW

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C-1

1 August 2002

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

The Commission reviewed and approved, after its 18 July meeting, the final quotations for the Tomas G. Masaryk Memorial as state on the attached sheet. The revised quotes for the sculpture's pedestal were circulated to the members for their consideration and were felt to be appropriate for the memorial. The revisions have eliminated the potential for misinterpretation that was problematic with the previous submission. In addition, the new inscriptions for the sides of the pedestal were vetted through independent experts in Czech history with no objections.

The members look forward to the memorial's completion and dedication on the 19th of September.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Mr. Terry Carlstrom
Regional Director, National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, D.C. 20242

cc: Jakub Slalník, Embassy of the Czech Republic
Milton Cerny, American Friends of the Czech Republic

MASARYK INSCRIPTIONS

FRONT:

TOMÁŠ GARRIGUE MASARYK
1850 – 1937

Professor, creator of a democracy and champion of liberty

President of Czechoslovakia
1918 – 1935

RIGHT SIDE:

"We accept the American principles as laid down by President Wilson: the principles of liberated mankind, of the actual equality of nations, and of government deriving all their just power from the consent of the governed."

Declaration of Czechoslovakia

T.G. Masaryk
Independence Square
Philadelphia
October 27, 1918

LEFT SIDE:

"Seven decades ago, an unprecedented partnership began between two Presidents: the philosopher, Tomas Masaryk, and the idealistic scholar, Woodrow Wilson. It was a partnership as well among Czechs and Slovaks to join together in federation. And, yes, it was a long, hard road from their work on your Declaration of Independence to this magnificent celebration today. I am proud to walk these last steps with you as one shared journey ends and another begins."

Commemoration of the End of Communist Rule

President George H.W. Bush
Wenceslas Square
Prague
November 17, 1990

BACK:

Presented as a gift to
The United States of America
from
The Czech Republic
and
American Friends of the Czech Republic
September 19, 2002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

During its meeting on 18 July, the Commission reviewed and approved the revised concept design for the perimeter security improvements around the Jefferson Memorial. We understand the previously approved wall within the road around the memorial ring itself will not suffice to protect the Memorial and its visitors. The Commission feels the new approach to provide security along East Basin Drive with a low stone wall, landscape berms and special entry points is both attractive and inconspicuous as it takes advantage of and works with the existing landscape. The variation of the scheme with the stone-lined swale should be avoided as the rock swale would be difficult to maintain and keep clean of debris.

Relocating the parking lot adjacent to the Memorial will assist in providing security. It would be better yet, at least visually, if the handicapped parking spaces to be provided along the road can be limited to areas outside the central axis of the Memorial vista. Retaining the existing configuration of the walkways to either side of the new lawn, although narrowed to a pedestrian scale, is acceptable. If, in the future, further consideration is given to returning the alignment to Olmsted's original intent, we would gladly take it into consideration.

We look forward to the review of the design development and the selection of materials.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Terry R. Carlstrom
Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, DC 20242

cc: John Parsons, NPS
Jeff Lee, Lee + Liu Landscape Architects
Michael Broderick, McKissack & McKissack

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. Parsons:

At its 18 July meeting, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed photographs of Wendy Ross's sculpture, *Bloom*, which the Federal Reserve intends to place on parkland to the side of the William M. Martin Building. There was no objection to the sculpture or its placement, which we understand is for a period of one year.

The Commission was pleased to approve another installation in this distinguished series of sculpture exhibitions.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

John G. Parsons, Associate Regional Director
Lands, Resources, and Planning
National Park Service
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, DC 20242

cc: Mary Anne Goley

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

5 August 2002

Dear Ms. Fore:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the Congressional Gold Medal honoring General Henry H. Shelton at its meeting on 18 July.

I am happy to say that the members were pleased with both the obverse and reverse designs and gave them their unanimous approval.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

The Honorable Henrietta Holsman Fore
Director, United States Mint
801 9th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT G

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. McGill:

During its meeting of 18 July the Commission reviewed the concept design for an underground parking facility to be located at the southwest corner of Judiciary Square, at Indiana Avenue and 5th Street, NW. While the Commission thought the proposal was reasonable, the members deferred making a recommendation and requested GSA submit a master plan for Judiciary Square in its entirety, so that the proposal can be assessed in context with the numerous other projects being proposed for development within the area. The members were concerned with the apparent absence of coordination between these projects and the potential accumulative impact they will have on the square and its significant collection of historic structures.

To assist with the sharing of information and coordination of projects in Judiciary Square, the Commission will invite GSA to join a work group to be convened in the near future. We hope to have representatives from all the resident organizations and the District of Columbia's Office of Historic Preservation and Office of Planning at the table, so that as a collective group, we can understand how these projects will affect the Square and avoid potentially costly mistakes.

Please submit a draft of the master plan when ready. The staff is available should you or the design team have questions.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Michael McGill
Senior Project Manager
U.S. General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service, NCR
Portfolio Management Division
301 7th Street, SW, Room 7600
Washington, DC 20407-0001

cc: Enrique A. Bellini, AIA, KCCT
Joseph E. Sanchez, DC Courts
Robert J. Bieber, US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT H

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. Floyd:

During its meeting on 18 July, the Commission was presented with the design guidelines for the proposed underground National Law Enforcement Museum at Judiciary Square. We appreciate the opportunity to comment at an early stage of the design process.

Most of the members' comments concerned the placement of structures above ground. The Commission notes that an underground facility of this scale would require mechanical equipment on the surface. The members question the options available to the designer for the placement of cooling towers and other equipment; as of now, they have not yet been presented. These potentially unsightly mechanical features need to be an integral part of any proposal early in the concept phase rather than an afterthought during design development.

One of the elements of the design that merits further consideration is the placing of the entrance pavilions on the grounds of the Law Enforcement Memorial across E Street from the proposed site. Physically and visually connecting the museum with the memorial would facilitate the transition to the underground structure. Forcing visitors to cross what is a very busy street may have an adverse impact on the full enjoyment of the memorial–museum experience.

It will be important that the GSA master plan for Judiciary Square be consulted should the entry pavilions remain on the south side of E Street. The Commission staff is organizing a work group on this plan and you will be invited to attend.

We look forward to the progress of the museum design project. The staff is available to assist you.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Craig W. Floyd
Chairman, National Law Enforcement
Officers Memorial Fund, Inc.
605 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004

cc: John W. Parsons, NPS
Davis Buckley Architects

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT I

5 August 2002

Dear Ms. Donlon:

During its meeting of 18 July, the Commission approved the revised exterior lighting scheme for the Kennedy Center as demonstrated the night of 17 July during the Commission site inspection. The members found the whiter color of the light on the walls to be much improved over the previous mockup in May. It was agreed the columns should be highlighted with fixtures set as close to the top of the individual columns as possible. The critical element with lighting the columns will be the careful focusing of the lighting fixtures. The columns should be illuminated so that the tops appear bright and jewel-like, with the light raking down the shafts and fading gradually to the bottom, with only a very small pool of light surrounding the bases. In addition, provision should be made to allow the wall lights and column lights to be individually controlled and adjusted with dimmers; the total light on each side of the building should be adjustable, too. This will allow the structure, when illuminated, to be modeled subtlety with light, so that it will not appear two-dimensional from an angled view.

Once the installation is in place, the final focusing of the lighting fixtures will be subject to the Commission's approval. Please coordinate a site visit with the staff when ready. As always, the staff is available should you or the design team require assistance.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Ms. Claudette Donlon
Senior Vice President
Administration
The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
Washington, D.C. 20566-0001

cc: William R. Taylor, Kennedy Center
Ray Grenald, AIA
Kenneth Lewandowski, AIA
David A. Mittelstadt, ASLA

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT J

5 August 2002

Dear Dr. Spelman:

During its meeting on 18 July, the Commission reviewed two projects for the National Zoological Park; the alterations to the entrance gates and the final designs for the Farm Exhibit. Both projects received unanimous approval.

The alterations to the pedestrian entrance gates on Connecticut Avenue will include the installation of two bronze replicas of the Taft Bridge lions, reproduced by Reinaldo Lopez, sculptor. We cannot find a more appropriate location for the lion sculptures than the Zoo. Their installation close to the sidewalk above a low base and surrounded by landscaping will make them visible to both the pedestrian and the vehicular traffic, landmarking the Zoo entrance. The replicas made in bronze, the intended material of the sculptor for the original Taft Bridge lions, will be a welcome addition to Washington's public sculpture.

The final construction drawings for the Farm Exhibit and the detailed information on the exhibits themselves were well received. We note the possibility that aspects of the project may not go forward, depending on funding. The alternates presented were acceptable, as the changes would neither lessen the experience of the farm exhibit by the visitor nor detract from the overall layout and planning.

We look forward to the completion of these two wonderful additions to the Zoo.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Dr. Lucy Spelman
Director, Smithsonian National Zoological Park
Washington DC 20008-2598

cc: Michelle Kayon, National Zoo
Reinaldo Lopez

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT K

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. Earle:

At its meeting of 18 July, the Commission reviewed the final design for the addition to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center at Bolling Air Force Base. The members unanimously approved the building and its associated parking structures and site amenities, feeling that it will be a handsome extension of the original facility and will contribute significantly to the architecture of the base and the city.

We commend you and the design team on a project well done and look forward to its completion.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Lawrence P. Earle
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
1314 Harwood Street, SE
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, DC 20374-5018

cc: Eugene Washington, Dept. of the Navy
Cynthia Johnson, AIA, SmithGroup

EXHIBIT L

REPORT OF THE OLD GEORGETOWN BOARD
to
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 July 2002

O.G. 02-256 HPA. 02-450	3700 O Street, NW Georgetown University Ryan Administration Building MBNA Performing Arts Center	Performing Arts Center addition - revised design - conceptual

REPORT: A new Performing Arts Center is proposed for the Georgetown University campus. The 1906 Ryan Administration Building, located north of the "Old North" building on the campus, will be reused and expanded with a major addition to house the Arts Center. The Commission reviewed and approved a previous concept design at their meeting 15 March 2001, as well as a revised design with a reduced footprint presented at their 21 March 2002 meeting. The same architectural firm of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates has developed a third design scheme, which is presented at this time. The Board reviewed this new proposal at their meeting 8 July 2002.

With encouragement from the donor the new proposal expands the new facility to accommodate a program that is focused more towards the academics of theater studies program. The design intent of the expansion is to provide classroom space, a costume shop, costume and set storage, rehearsal space, and office space for the Theater Program. The design takes on a more traditional facade compared to the patterned brick proposed in the last scheme. The board

feels the new direction the design is taking is an improvement over past design proposals. However, they raised concerns about the angle and offset depth of the south window wall configuration requiring further study.

The Board recommends the following Action.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: No objection to the revised general concept design for proposed new MBNA Performing Arts Center for the Georgetown University campus as shown in drawings received and dated 8 July 2002 which incorporate an expanded program and delete the patterned brick shown in previous design. Recommend further study of the south window wall configuration of the new structure. File new submission of the development of the concept design for review by the Commission when ready.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT L-1

5 August 2002

Dear Mr. Brangman:

The Commission reviewed and approved the revised concept designs for the proposed MBNA Performing Arts Center at Georgetown University during its meeting on 18 July. We are delighted that a sponsor came forward to fund the additional facilities needed to bring the proposed Performing Arts Center up to the standards expected of Georgetown University.

Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates has provided three very different schemes, all of which have received our approval. We encourage the architect to continue to study the angled wall corridor, particularly in the detailing of its windows, to relate it to the other elements of the structure, while maintaining its distinct character expressive of a more public function.

We look forward to the review of the development of the concept design and material selection when they are ready.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Mr. Alan Brangman
Georgetown University
Planning and Project Management
New South Building - West Lobby
3700 O Street, NW
Washington DC 20057

cc: Karen Frank, Georgetown University
Hugh Hardy, Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates
Tim Denné, DC HPD
Peter Pulsifer, ANC 2E
Barbara Zartman, CAG

EXHIBIT M

REPORT OF THE OLD GEORGETOWN BOARD
to
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 July 2002

O.G. 02-215 HPA. 02-391	1703 32nd Street, NW Trustees for Harvard University Dumbarton Oaks Library building	New library building - revised design - conceptual

REPORT: After the Commission reviewed and disapproved the previous concept design for a library addition to the Dumbarton Oaks campus at its meeting 21 March 2002 (see previous case O.G. 02-135), the Board reviewed a revised design at its meeting 6 June, and yet further revisions at their 8 July 2002 meeting. The scheme presented in June had been developed as a hipped roof variation of the original design. The most recent proposal introduces a gable roof in the center of the building, with clerestory windows to either side. The Board acknowledges the architects' response to the Commission's recommendation that the building have a sloped roof, and encourage further development in this direction.

However, the Board felt that the principal objections it had expressed at the previous meetings concerning the need to relate the scale of the building to the existing structures and landscape of the historic Dumbarton Oaks campus had not been adequately addressed. The Board has continuously recommended softening the relationship of the building to its site on the

dell incorporating additional landscaped terraces. These terraces, which also appear elsewhere in the campus, help reinforce the existing wooded landscaping, serve as a transition from buildings to their setting, and, more significantly, lessen the impact of the building on the dell and the Park, particularly as seen from Dumbarton Oaks Park. In addition, the Board feels that placing the upper levels of the new library building atop these landscaped terraces in the scale of a 2-story structure would soften the visual impact as perceived from S Street.

In their most recent scheme, the architects proposed modifications to the single terrace and planters as they surround the lowest level of the building. Stone was introduced at the base of the brick building in an attempt to create a sense of additional landscaped terraces. However, the Board considered it to be insufficient to reduce the apparent height of the building.

In addition, the window openings were revised in the later concept design. While these adjustments are an attempt to relate the new building to the campus, the Board felt that the scale of the windows retain a sense of verticality which they have recommended against in the past.

The Board continues to be concerned at the lack of progress in the development of an acceptable design. They hope the new library addition will enhance the overall character of Dumbarton Oaks and not just stand as a contrast to the rest of the complex. As such, the Board recommends the following Action:

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend **AGAINST** proposed concept development for new library building at the Dumbarton Oaks campus as shown in revised schemes. Commend development of building design which incorporates a sloped roof on the library building. Recommend further study of the lower level landscaped terraces and walls (configuration and materials) to reduce the apparent height of the new building by providing a base upon which a two story structure sits. Recommend further study of scale and details of building openings to relate to detail and scale of existing historic buildings. File new submission of the development of a revised concept design for review by the Commission when ready.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT M-1

5 August 2002

Dear Dr. Keenan:

During its meeting on 18 July, the Commission reviewed the revised concept design for the proposed addition of a new library building to Dumbarton Oaks in the Georgetown Historic District. As you know, the landscape plan by James Urban and the service court buildings received concept approval at our previous meeting on 21 March.

We agree with the Old Georgetown Board that the revisions to the original design are not successful enough to make the new building fit in with the other historic buildings on the campus. The overall revised design is not sufficiently compatible with nor sensitive to its context. As such, we are not able to approve it as presented.

In this particular case, and considering the limited visibility from public thoroughfares and the reduced impact on S Street offered by the dense vegetation of the dell, we feel Dumbarton Oaks has an opportunity to make a lasting statement of design with the new building. We encourage you and your architectural team to revisit your original design for the library building and modify it in such a way as to present a convincing argument of its appropriateness within both the historic district and the varied architectural vocabulary existent on the campus.

We look forward to meeting with you again in the near future to review the design development. The staff is available to assist you.

Sincerely,

Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA
Chairman

Dr. Edward Keenan
Director, Dumbarton Oaks
Trustees for Harvard University
1703 32nd Street, NW
Washington DC 20007

cc: Robert Venturi, Venturi Scott Brown and Associates
Norman M. Glasgow, Jr., Holland & Knight, LLP
Tim Dennée, DC HPD
Peter Pulsifer, ANC 2E
Barbara Zartman, CAG

18 July 2002 EXHIBIT N

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE
AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-102	1101 6th Street, SW Arena Stage	Additions and alterations - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: The concept design for proposed additions and alterations to the Arena Stage, as shown in drawings dated 8 July 2002, was well received and the concept approved during the Commission 18 July 2002 meeting. The proposed scheme will provide an attractive amenity in the Southwest portion of the city. File new concept submission of design development drawings, including details and material samples for review by the Commission when ready.